

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Turning first to the rejection of claims 5 and 8 based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, the support “brace” previously presented in claim 5 should have been and has now been amended to read “support element” consistent with claim 1. With respect to claim 8, the term “braces” similarly has been amended to recite “elements.” The Examiner questions that it is not clear that a powder coated metal would also be nonconductive. The nonconductive descriptor defines the powder coated metal. Thus, the powder coated metal is as claimed “nonconductive.” The manner in which the “powder coated metal” is nonconductive is of no moment since applicants are claiming a nonconductive powder coated metal. In any event, powder coatings oftentimes serve as electrical insulators.

By the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the subject matter of claim 6, which has been indicated as allowable by the Examiner, has been incorporated into claim 1. Claim 6 has been cancelled. Accordingly, applicants submit that claims 1-5, 7 and 8 ought now be formally allowed since claims 2-5, 7 and 8 depend from claim 1.

The amendment to the specification simply conforms a paragraph of the brief description of the invention to claim 1 as now should formally be allowed.

KAMINSKI ET AL.
Appl. No. 10/806,171
August 23, 2005

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the claims presently pending in the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: Richard Besha
Richard G. Besha
Reg. No. 22,770

RGB:rl
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100